

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In the current chapter, the analysis of data and the interpretation of results are presented. According to Kerlinger (1989: 125-126), the analysis of data means categorising, ordering, manipulating and summarising data in order to obtain answers to a research problem. Kerlinger further defines the interpretation of results as taking the results of data analysis and making inferences pertinent to the research relations studied in order to draw conclusions about these relations. Furthermore, from the analysis of data and the interpretation of results, the researcher obtains more meaningful implications that the studied variables have for the research problem and the research sub-problems.

By using the contingency tables (see section 3.8 above), the researcher presents the analysis of data and the interpretation of results in the following section of the present chapter. To facilitate the interpretation of results, the percentages of the responses that are in the same direction, namely, strongly agree and agree, and strongly disagree and disagree were added together. At the end of the chapter, the researcher tests the null hypotheses that were stated in chapter three.

4.2 DISPLAY, ANALYSIS OF DATA AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

This section is divided into two sub-sections, namely, the biographical details of the respondents and the respondents' views on the practice of instructional leadership by principals in the selected secondary schools in the Vryheid region in KwaZulu-Natal.

4.2.1 Biographical details of respondents

Table 4.1: Gender of respondents

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>40.7</i>
	<i>Female</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>59.3</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>46.4</i>
	<i>Female</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>53.6</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.1 indicates that in both categories of schools, namely, the higher and the lower performing schools, a little more than 50% (59.3 and 53.6% respectively) of educators were females. It can, therefore, be concluded that gender of educators is not an important factor influencing the school's academic performance.

Table 4.2: Age of respondents

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>00 – 24 years</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.9</i>
	<i>25 – 30 years</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>16.7</i>
	<i>31 – 36 years</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>51.9</i>
	<i>37 – 45 years</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>25.9</i>
	<i>46 – 50 years</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.9</i>
	<i>51 – 65 years</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.9</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>00 – 24 years</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3.6</i>
	<i>25 – 30 years</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>12.5</i>
	<i>31 – 36 years</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>57.1</i>
	<i>37 – 45 years</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>21.4</i>
	<i>46 – 50 years</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>5.4</i>
	<i>51 – 65 years</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.2 shows that in both categories of schools, namely, the higher and the lower performing schools, young educators, namely, 36 years and younger, make up a large percentage, namely 70.5% (1.9 + 16.7 + 51.9%) and 73.2% (3.6 + 12.5 + 57.1%) respectively, of the total educators. Thus, age groups in the two categories of schools were similar. It can, therefore, be concluded that the age of educators serving at school is not a factor with a significant impact on the school's academic achievement.

Table 4.3: Respondents' highest academic qualifications

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Teacher's qualifications</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage(%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Grade 12 / Standard 10</i>	2	3.7
	<i>Teacher's diploma</i>	19	35.2
	<i>Teacher's diploma + FDE</i>	15	27.8
	<i>Bachelor's degree</i>	4	7.4
	<i>Bachelor's degree + Teacher's diploma</i>	7	13.0
	<i>Honour's degree + Teacher's diploma</i>	6	11.1
	<i>Other</i>	1	1.8
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Grade 12 / Standard 10</i>	1	1.8
	<i>Teacher's diploma</i>	16	28.6
	<i>Teacher's diploma + FDE</i>	17	30.4
	<i>Bachelor's degree</i>	5	8.9
	<i>Bachelor's degree + Teacher's diploma</i>	16	28.6
	<i>Honour's degree + Teacher's diploma</i>	0	0.0
	<i>Other</i>	1	1.8
	Total	56	100

Table 4.3 shows that:

- in the higher performing schools, 3.7% of the respondents had Grade 12 as the highest academic qualification, while in the lower performing schools, 1.8% of the respondents had Grade 12 as the highest academic qualification, and
- in the higher performing schools, 24.1% (13.0 + 11.1) of the respondents had degrees plus the teachers' diploma, while in the lower

performing schools, 28.6% had these qualifications. This indicates that the educators in the two categories of schools had similar qualifications. Thus, the qualifications possessed by the educators are not the cause of difference in the overall academic performance of schools.

Table 4.4: Respondents' years of teaching experience

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Teachers' years of teaching experience.</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>1 – 5 years</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>22.2</i>
	<i>6 – 10 years</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>50.0</i>
	<i>More than 10 years</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>27.8</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>1 – 5 years</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>19.6</i>
	<i>6 – 10 years</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>50.0</i>
	<i>More than 10 years</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>30.4</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.4 shows that in both categories of schools, the educators had similar years of teaching experience. In the higher performing schools, 77.8% (50.0 + 27.8%) of the respondents, while in the lower performing ones, 80.4% (50.0 + 30.4%) of the respondents indicated that they had six and more years of teaching experience.

Table 4.5 Respondents' years at present school

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Years at present school</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>1 - 5 years</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>37.0</i>
	<i>6 - 10 years</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>48.1</i>
	<i>More than 10 years</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>14.8</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>1 - 5 years</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>37.5</i>
	<i>6 - 10 years</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>50.0</i>
	<i>More than 10 years</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>12.5</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.5 shows that in both categories of schools, the majority of respondents were those that have been at their present schools for six or more years. In the higher performing schools, 62.9% (48.1 + 14.8%) of the respondents and in the lower performing schools, 62.5% (50.0 + 12.5%) of the respondents indicated that they have been at their present schools for six or more years. Thus, the two categories of schools were similar regarding the number of years that educators had been at their present schools.

Table 4.6: Respondents' rank of position held at school

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Rank of position held at school</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Educator</i>	40	74.1
	<i>Head of department</i>	12	22.2
	<i>Deputy principal</i>	2	3.7
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Educator</i>	42	75.0
	<i>Head of department</i>	11	19.6
	<i>Deputy principal</i>	3	5.4
	Total	56	100

Table 4.6 shows that:

- in the higher performing schools, 74.1% versus 75.0% of the respondents in the lower performing schools held the ranks of educators;
- in the higher performing schools, 25.9% (22.2 + 3.7%) of the respondents were in promotion positions, namely, the Head of Departments and the Deputy principals;
- in the lower performing schools, 25.0% (19.6 + 5.4%) of the respondents were in promotion positions, namely, the Head of Departments and the Deputy principals, and
- the respondents' rank of positions held at the two categories of schools did not differ significantly.

It does appear, therefore, that the rank of educators is not the determinant of the learners' academic performance at schools.

Table 4.7: Respondents according to ethnic groups

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Ethnic group</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>African</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
	<i>Asian</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Coloured</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Indian</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>White</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>African</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>
	<i>Asian</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Coloured</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Indian</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>White</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.7 shows that in both categories of schools, the respondents were educators of the same ethnic group, namely, Black Africans. Therefore, one can maintain that ethnicity is not a significant determinant of the learners' academic achievement.

Table 4.8 School's geographical location

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>School's location</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Semi-urban</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Rural</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Semi-urban</i>	<i>00</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Rural</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>
	Total	56	100

Table 4.8 shows that the empirical research for the study was conducted in rural schools. Therefore, one can argue that the location of a school is not a significant determinant of the learners' academic achievement.

The analysis of data on the respondents' biographical variables revealed that the differences in academic achievement of learners is probably not caused by differences in biographical aspects of educators serving in different schools. The two categories of schools were similar with regards to geographical data.

In the following sub-section, the researcher presents the analysis of data and the interpretation of results on the practice of instructional leadership by principals in selected secondary schools in the Vryheid region.

4.2.2 The respondents' views on the practice of instructional leadership by principals

Table 4.9: The principal does everything possible to get the teaching resources for educators

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	6	11.1
	<i>Disagree</i>	4	7.4
	<i>Agree</i>	28	51.9
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	16	29.6
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	15	26.8
	<i>Disagree</i>	24	42.9
	<i>Agree</i>	16	28.6
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	1	1.7
	Total	56	100

Table 4.9 illustrates that

- in the higher performing schools, 81.5% (51.9 + 29.6%) of the respondents agreed that the principals do everything possible to get the teaching resources for educators while, and
- in the lower performing schools, only 30.3% (28.6 + 1.7%) of the respondents agreed that the principals do everything possible to get the teaching resources for educators. In the lower performing schools, a large percentage, namely 69.7% (26.8 + 42.9%), of the respondents denied that principals do everything possible to get teaching resources for educators.

The big differences in the responses of the respondents clearly show the importance of the principal's role in securing the necessary teaching resources for educators.

Table 4.10: The principal formulates and communicates the school's academic goals to educators at the beginning of the year

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Responses</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	2	3.7
	<i>Disagree</i>	0	0.0
	<i>Agree</i>	26	48.1
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	26	48.1
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	29	51.8
	<i>Disagree</i>	13	23.2
	<i>Agree</i>	12	21.4
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	2	3.6
	Total	56	100

Table 4.10 illustrates that:

- in the schools with higher academic performance, 96.2% (48.1 + 48.1%) of the respondents agreed that principals formulate and communicate the school's academic goals to educators at the beginning of the year, while
- in the schools with lower academic performance, 75% (51.8 + 23.2%) of the respondents disagreed that principals formulate and communicate the school's academic goals at the beginning of the year.

The big differences in the responses of respondents on the formulation and communication of school's academic goals by principals, clearly show the differences in the emphasis that principals place on school's academic goals as a dimension of instructional leadership in the two categories of schools.

Table 4.11: The principal has put in place the policy for testing and examining learners in the various subjects

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	5	9.2
	<i>Disagree</i>	6	11.1
	<i>Agree</i>	34	63.0
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	9	16.7
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	3	5.3
	<i>Disagree</i>	24	42.9
	<i>Agree</i>	26	46.5
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	3	5.3
	Total	56	100

Table 4.11 shows that

- in the higher performing schools, a large percentage of respondents, namely, 79.7% (63.0 + 16.7%) agreed that principals have put in place the policies for testing and examining learners in the various subjects, while
- in the lower performing schools, the number of respondents who agreed, 51.8% (46.5 + 5.3%) is not very different from the number of respondents who disagreed, 48.2% (5.3 + 42.9%).

The very large percentage, namely 79.7%, of respondents who agreed that principals in the higher performing schools have put in place the policies for testing of learners in different subjects, clearly indicates that the testing and examining practices and procedures are clear to educators in the higher performing schools. However, the insignificant difference of 3.6% (51.8 - 48.2%) between the respondents who agreed (51.8%) and those that disagreed (48.2%) on the policy for testing and examining learners in various subjects in the lower performing schools, indicates that the testing and examining practices and procedures are not very clear to educators in the lower performing schools.

Table 4.12: The principal sometimes discusses the teaching practices with the individual educators

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	9	16.6
	<i>Disagree</i>	6	11.1
	<i>Agree</i>	28	51.9
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	11	20.4
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	7	12.5
	<i>Disagree</i>	34	60.7
	<i>Agree</i>	13	23.2
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	2	3.6
	Total	56	100

Table 4.12 illustrates that while 73.2% (12.5 + 60.7%) of the respondents in the lower performing schools disagreed that principals discuss teaching practices with the individual educators, an almost equal percentage of 72.3% (51.9 + 20.4%) of respondents in the higher performing schools agreed that principals discuss the teaching practices with the individual educators.

This shows that in the higher performing schools, the principals are involved with individual educators as well as the teaching practices, but in the lower performing schools, the principals are less involved with the educators and the teaching practices in schools.

Table 4.13: The principal always encourages the analysis of students' results in tests

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	3	5.6
	<i>Disagree</i>	6	11.1
	<i>Agree</i>	23	42.6
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	22	40.7
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	32	57.1
	<i>Disagree</i>	10	17.9
	<i>Agree</i>	12	21.4
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	2	3.6
	Total	56	100

Table 4.13 illustrates that

- 83.3% (42.6 + 40.7%) of the respondents, in the higher performing schools agreed that principals always encourage the analysis of students' results in tests, but
- only 25% (21.4 + 3.6%) of the respondents, in the lower performing schools, agreed that principals encourage the analysis of students' results in tests. A very large percentage of respondents in the lower performing schools, namely 75% (57.1 + 17.9%), disagreed that principals encourage the analysis of students' results in tests.

This clearly shows the difference that exists in the quality control practice between the higher and the lower performing schools. In the higher performing schools, the principals encourage the analysis of the students' test results.

Table 4.14: The principal discusses the school's academic goals with educators during staff meetings

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.8</i>
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	<i>Agree</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>59.3</i>
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>38.9</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>19.6</i>
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>44.6</i>
	<i>Agree</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>25.0</i>
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>10.8</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.14 illustrates that:

- in the higher performing schools, 98.2% (59.3 + 38.9%) of the respondents agreed that the principals discuss the school's academic goals with the educators during staff meetings, but
- in the lower performing schools, 35.8% (25.0 + 10.8%) of the respondents agreed that the principals discuss the school's academic goals with the educators during staff meetings. In the lower performing schools, a very large percentage, 64.2% (19.6 + 44.6%) of the respondents disagreed that principals discuss the school's academic goals with the educators during staff meetings.

The large differences in the responses of the respondents on the discussion of the school's academic goals by principals during staff meetings in the two categories of schools indicates that principals in the two categories of schools do not place the same emphasis on school's academic goals.

Table 4.15: The principal assists educators in analysing test results in order to determine the progress towards the school's academic goals

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	5	9.2
	<i>Disagree</i>	9	16.7
	<i>Agree</i>	19	35.2
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	21	38.9
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	33	58.9
	<i>Disagree</i>	15	26.8
	<i>Agree</i>	5	8.9
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	3	5.4

	Total	56	100
--	--------------	-----------	------------

Table 4.15 shows that

- in the higher performing schools, 74.1% (35.2 + 38.9%) of the respondents agreed that the principals assist educators in analysing test results in order to determine the progress towards the school's academic goals, but
- in the lower performing schools, only 14.3% (8.9 + 5.4%) of the respondents agreed that the principals assist educators in analysing test results in order to determine the progress towards the school's academic goals. In the lower performing schools, 84.7% (58.9 + 26.8%) of the respondents denied that the principals assist educators in analysing test results in order to determine progress towards the school's academic goals.

This again indicates that the principals in the two categories of schools do not place the same emphasis on the school's academic goals and thus, on quality control, as these are part of the instructional leadership activities.

Table 4.16: The principal conducts classroom visits to identify teachers' strengths and weaknesses in the teaching activities

School's academic performance	Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	8	14.8
	<i>Disagree</i>	15	27.8
	<i>Agree</i>	25	46.3
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	6	11.1
	Total	54	100

<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>14.3</i>
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>51.8</i>
	<i>Agree</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>33.9</i>
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.0</i>
	Total	56	100

Table 4.16 illustrates that

- in the higher performing schools, 57.4% (46.3 + 11.1%) of the respondents agreed that principals do conduct classroom visits during the teaching process. The 57.4% of the respondents who agreed that principals do conduct classroom visits, in the higher performing schools, is a little above the 42.6% (14.8 + 27.8%) of the respondents who, in the same schools, disagreed that principals conduct classroom visits, but
- in the lower performing schools, 66.1% (14.3 + 51.8%) of the respondents clearly disagreed that principals conduct classroom visits during the teaching process.

The difference of 14.8% (57.4 - 42.6%), between the respondents who agreed and those that disagreed in the higher performing schools, indicates that even in the higher performing schools classroom visit needs to be given attention by principals.

Table 4.17 The principal insists that educators should follow the school's established set of pass requirements for various school subjects when assessing learners

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.8</i>
	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>9.3</i>

	<i>Agree</i>	37	68.5
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	11	20.4
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	2	3.6
	<i>Disagree</i>	16	28.6
	<i>Agree</i>	32	57.1
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	6	10.7
	Total	56	100

Table 4.17 shows that in both categories of schools, namely, the higher and the lower performing schools, the large number of respondents agreed that principals insist that schools' established set of pass requirements be followed when assessing the learners in the various school subjects. In the higher performing schools, 88.9% (68.5 + 20.4%) while in the lower performing schools, 67.8% (57.1 + 10.7%) of the respondents agreed that principals insist that educators should use the school's established set of pass requirements when assessing learners in the various subjects.

Table 4.18 The principal often ask educators to design strategies with which to achieve the school's academic goals

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	0	0.0
	<i>Disagree</i>	4	7.4
	<i>Agree</i>	27	50.0
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	23	42.6
	Total	54	100

<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	35	62.5
	<i>Disagree</i>	12	21.4
	<i>Agree</i>	7	12.5
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	2	3.6
	Total	56	100

Table 4.18 illustrates that:

- in the higher performing schools, a very large number of the respondents, 92.6% (50.0 + 42.6%) agreed that principals often ask educators to design strategies with which to achieve the school's academic goals, but
- in the lower performing schools, only 16.1% (12.5 + 3.6%) of the respondents agreed that principals often ask educators to design strategies with which to achieve the school's academic goals. A very large percentage, 83.9% (62.5 + 21.4%) of the respondents disagreed that principals often ask educators to design strategies for achieving the school's academic goals.

This clearly shows that principals, in the two categories of schools, do not place the same emphasis on the importance of the school's academic goals.

Table 4.19 The principal often discusses with the learners about their progress in the school's academic work

School's academic performance	Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	5	9.2
	<i>Disagree</i>	7	13.0
	<i>Agree</i>	35	64.8

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	7	13.0
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	8	14.3
	<i>Disagree</i>	38	67.9
	<i>Agree</i>	8	14.3
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	2	3.5
	Total	56	100

Table 4.19 illustrates that:

- a very large percentage, 77.8% (64.8 + 13.0%) of educators in the higher performing schools agreed that principals often discuss with the learners about their progress in the school's academic work; and
- a very large percentage, 82.2% (14.3 + 67.9%) of educators in the lower performing schools disagreed that principals often discuss with the learners about their progress in the school's academic work.

It can be concluded, therefore, that in the higher performing schools principals maintain regular contact with the learners in order to promote their academic success, but in the lower performing schools, principals maintain very little or no contact at all with the learners as an effort to promote their academic success.

Table 4.20: The principal sometimes discusses the teaching practice with educators in groups

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	8	14.8
	<i>Disagree</i>	9	16.6
	<i>Agree</i>	30	55.6

	<i>Strongly agree</i>	7	13.0
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	8	14.3
	<i>Disagree</i>	32	57.1
	<i>Agree</i>	14	25.0
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	2	3.6
	Total	56	100

Table 4.20 illustrates that

- in the higher performing schools, 68.6% (55.6 + 13.0%) percentage of educators agreed that principals sometimes discuss the teaching practices with educators in groups, but
- in the lower performing schools, only a small percentage of educators, 28.6% (25.0 + 3.6%) agreed that principals sometimes discuss the teaching practices with educators in groups. A large number of educators, 71.4% (14.3 + 57.1%) in the lower performing schools disagreed that principals sometimes discuss the teaching practices with them in groups.

It is, therefore, clear that principals in the higher performing schools can share their teaching expertise with educators during the sessions arranged for the discussion of teaching practices, but that is not the case with principals in the lower performing schools.

Table 4.21: The principal insists that homework be given to learners regularly

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
--------------------------------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------------

<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	6	11.1
	<i>Disagree</i>	5	9.3
	<i>Agree</i>	33	61.1
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	10	18.5
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	2	3.6
	<i>Disagree</i>	26	46.4
	<i>Agree</i>	25	44.6
	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	3	5.4
	Total	56	100

Table 4.21 illustrates that:

- principals in the higher performing schools believe in homework given to learners regularly. This is reflected in 79.6% (61.1 + 18.5%) of the respondents who agreed that principals, in the higher performing schools, insist that homework be given to learners regularly, and
- in the lower performing schools, the principals' pressure on educators to give homework to learners regularly is not clear. This is reflected in the fact that the number of respondents who agreed is equal to the number of respondents who disagreed with the statement on principals insisting that homework be given to learners regularly. That is, 50.0% (3.6 + 46.4%) of the respondents, in the lower performing schools agreed, while at the same time 50.0 % (44.6 + 5.4%) of the respondents in the same schools disagreed with the statement on the principals' insisting that homework be given to learners regularly.

Table 4.22: The principal assists educators in designing strategies for preparation of learners for examinations

School's academic performance	Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	6	11.1
	<i>Disagree</i>	6	11.1
	<i>Agree</i>	18	33.4
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	24	44.4
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>	36	64.2
	<i>Disagree</i>	10	17.9
	<i>Agree</i>	8	14.3
	<i>Strongly agree</i>	2	3.6
	Total	56	100

Table 4.22 illustrates that:

- in the higher performing schools, 77.8% (33.4 + 44.4%) of the respondents agreed that principals assist them in designing strategies for preparing learners for examinations, but
- in the lower performing schools, only 17.9% (14.3 + 3.6%) of respondents agreed that principals assist them in designing strategies for preparing learners for examinations. A very large percentage, 82.1% (64.2 + 17.9%) of the respondents in the lower performing schools disagreed that principals assist them in designing strategies with which to prepare learners for examinations.

This clearly shows the difference in the principals' concern for the learners' academic success in the two categories of schools.

Table 4.23: Does the principal look for help for educators who fail to achieve the targeted school academic performance objectives?

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>74.1</i>
	<i>No</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>25.9</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>17.9</i>
	<i>No</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>82.1</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.23 illustrates that

- in the higher performing schools, the principals assist educators who fail to achieve their targeted school academic objectives. This is confirmed by 74.1% of the respondents who responded positively to the question on assistance that principals are expected to give to educators who fail to achieve the targeted school academic performance objectives, and
- in the lower performing schools, the principals do not assist educators who fail to achieve their targeted school academic performance objectives. This is confirmed by 82.1% of the respondents who responded negatively to the question on assistance that principals are expected to give to educators who fail to achieve the targeted school academic performance objectives.

Table 4.24 Does the principal meet with educators to discuss the learners' academic performance in various school subjects?

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>87.0</i>

Higher performing schools

	<i>No</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>13.0</i>
	Total	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>23.2</i>
	<i>No</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>76.8</i>
	Total	56	100

Table 4.24 illustrates that in the higher performing schools, principals meet with educators to discuss the learners' academic performance in the various school subjects, but in the lower performing schools principals do not meet with educators to discuss the learners' academic performance in the various school subjects. This is reflected in the large number of respondents, namely 87.0%, in the higher performing schools, who responded positively to the question on the discussion of learners' academic performance in the various school subjects, compared to a large number of respondents, namely 76.8%, in the lower performing schools, who responded negatively to the question on the discussion of the learners' academic performance in the various school subjects.

Table 4.25 How often does the principal discuss the learners' academic performance with the educators?

<i>Schools' academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Never</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>5.6</i>
	<i>On a monthly basis</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>40.7</i>
	<i>On a quarterly basis</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>37.0</i>
	<i>On a half-yearly basis</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>16.7</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Never</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>48.2</i>
	<i>On a monthly basis</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>10.7</i>
	<i>On a quarterly basis</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>16.1</i>
	<i>On a half-yearly basis</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>25.0</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.25 illustrates that:

- in the higher performing schools, the frequency of discussion of learners' academic performance by principals together with educators is on a regular basis because 40.7% of the respondents indicated that principals discuss the learners' academic performance on a monthly basis, and 37.0% of the respondents indicated that the discussion of learners' academic performance is done on a quarterly basis. In both cases, the frequency of discussing the learners' academic performance, as a measure of monitoring progress towards the school's academic goals, is satisfactory, and
- in the lower performing schools, the practice of discussing the academic performance is unsatisfactory. The 48.2% of the respondents indicated that joint discussion of learners' academic performance by

principals and educators does not happen in their schools. A small number of respondents, namely 25.0%, indicated that the joint discussion of the learners' academic performance by principals and educators is done on a half-yearly basis. The discussion of learners' academic performance on a half-yearly basis is unsatisfactory because weaknesses in academic performance would have increased in number and intensified in strength such that it would be very difficult or impossible to eliminate all problem areas before learners sit for final examinations. This, obviously leads to lower academic performance by the school.

Table 4.26: Do you believe that the academic achievement of learners, to a large extent, depends on the principal's instructional leadership?

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	39	72.2
	<i>No</i>	15	27.8
	<i>Total</i>	54	100
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	44	78.6
	<i>No</i>	12	21.4
	<i>Total</i>	56	100

Table 4.26 shows that in both categories of schools, respondents believe that learners' academic achievement depends on the principal's instructional leadership. This is reflected in the large number of respondents, namely 72.2%, in the higher performing schools and 78.6% in the lower performing schools, who responded positively to the question in both categories of schools.

Table 4.27: Does the principal regularly conduct staff development in your school?

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>72.2</i>
	<i>No</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>27.8</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>19.6</i>
	<i>No</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>80.4</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.27 shows that a very large number of respondents, namely 80.4%, in the lower performing schools denied the regular presentation of staff development by principals, while a large number of respondents, namely 72.2% in the higher performing schools confirmed the presentation of staff development in their schools.

Thus, principals in the higher performing schools conduct staff development, while principals in the lower performing schools do not conduct staff development.

Table 4.28: How often does the principal conduct staff development?

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Never</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>18.5</i>
	<i>On a weekly basis</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>13.0</i>
	<i>On a monthly basis</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>37.0</i>
	<i>On a quarterly basis</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>31.5</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Never</i>	<i>34</i>	<i>60.7</i>
	<i>On a weekly basis</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>12.5</i>
	<i>On a monthly basis</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>7.2</i>
	<i>On a quarterly basis</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>19.6</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.28 illustrates that:

- in the higher performing schools, the frequency of staff development by the principals is satisfactory. This is reflected in 37.0% of the respondents who indicated that principals conduct staff development on a monthly basis and the 31.5% of the respondents who indicated that principals conduct staff development on a quarterly basis, and
- in the lower performing schools, 60.7% of the respondents indicated that, in their schools, principals do not conduct staff development. The likelihood is that educators, in the lower performing schools, would lack the ongoing opportunity to improve their teaching skills.

Table 4.29: Does the principal show concern about the completion of the syllabus in different subjects as early as possible?

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>92.6</i>
	<i>No</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>7.4</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>58.9</i>
	<i>No</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>41.1</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.29 illustrates that by comparison, the principals in the higher performing schools put greater emphasis on the early completion of syllabi in different subjects than the principals in the lower performing schools. This is reflected in the 92.6% of the respondents in the higher performing schools, compared to 58.9% of the respondents in the lower performing schools, who responded positively to the question on the early completion of the syllabus. Also, the large number of respondents, in the lower performing schools (41.1%) compared to a small number of respondents in the higher performing schools (7.4%) who responded negatively to the question suggests that principals in the higher performing schools put greater emphasis on the early completion of the syllabi than the principals in the lower performing schools.

Table 4.30: Does the principal encourage the formation of an academic networks with other schools?

<i>School's academic performance</i>	<i>Response</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Higher performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>85.2</i>
	<i>No</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>14.8</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Lower performing schools</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>17.9</i>
	<i>No</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>82.1</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4.30 illustrates that by comparison, the principals in the higher performing schools encourage the formation of academic networks, while the principals in the lower performing schools do not encourage the formation of academic networks with other schools. This is reflected in the 85.2% of the respondents in the higher performing schools as compared to 17.9% of the respondents in the lower performing schools who responded positively to the question on the formation of academic networks with other schools. Moreover, the large number of respondents in the lower performing schools (82.1%) compared to a small number of respondents in the higher performing schools (14.8%) who responded negatively to the question on the formation of academic networks illustrates that principals in the higher performing schools encourage the formation of academic networks with other schools, while principals in the lower performing schools do not.

In the next sub-section of the present chapter, the researcher uses the data contained in the same foregoing contingency tables for hypotheses testing.

4.3 HYPOTHESES TESTING

The four null-hypotheses stated in chapter three are tested in the current section through the use of a chi-square (χ^2) test. The responses of the respondents, from the higher and the lower performing schools, to items numbered 10, 24, 27 and 30 in the questionnaire were used to determine the significance of the principal's practice of instructional leadership to learners' academic achievement.

Firstly, in each case the contingency table with the observed frequencies of the respondents and the expected frequencies is given. In the contingency tables, the abbreviations obs. and exp. stand for the observed frequencies and the expected frequencies respectively. Then the chi-square (χ^2) test is applied to the observed and the expected frequencies of the respondents' responses to the instructional leadership variable in question in order to determine whether there is any statistical significance between that instructional leadership variable and the learners' academic achievement. The chi-square (χ^2) test is calculated using the following formula (Behr, 1988: 84):

$$\chi^2 = \sum \left[\frac{(\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{E})^2}{\mathbf{E}} \right]$$

where O = observed frequency, and

E = expected frequency

The chi-square (χ^2) results and the interpretation of such results, with regard to each null-hypothesis are given below with each contingency table.

Then the contingency coefficient (**C**) was calculated in order to determine the relationship between the principal's instructional leadership and the learners' academic achievement. The contingency coefficient (**C**) was calculated using the following formula (Kerlinger, 1989: 158):

$$C = \frac{\sqrt{\chi^2}}{N + \sqrt{\chi^2}}$$

where χ^2 = is the calculated value of the chi-square, and

N = is the total number of respondents

4.3.1 The impact of the school's academic goals on learners' academic achievement

Ho: Null hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between the learners' academic achievement in schools where principals clearly formulate and communicate the school's academic goals and the learners' academic achievement in schools where principals do not clearly formulate and communicate the school's academic goals.

Table 4.31: Formulation and communication of the school's academic goals

Response to item 10									
Categories of schools	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly agree		Total
	Obs.	Exp.	Obs.	Exp.	Obs.	Exp.	Obs.	Exp.	
Higher performing schools	2	15	0	6	26	19	26	14	54
Lower performing schools	29	16	13	7	12	19	2	14	56
Total	31		13		38		28		110

$$\begin{aligned}\chi^2 &= 62.00, \text{ where } (\chi^2) \text{ is the calculated value of the chi-square test.} \\ \chi^2_{\text{crit.}} &= 7.82, \text{ where } (\chi^2_{\text{crit.}}) \text{ is the critical value of the chi-square test.} \\ \text{df.} &= 3\end{aligned}$$

At the level of significance 0.05, χ^2 value of 62.00 is greater than χ^2 crit. value of 7.82. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. The conclusion is that the principal's role of formulating and communicating the school's academic goals is significant for the learners' academic achievement. There is, therefore, a significant difference between the learners' academic achievement in schools where principals clearly formulate and communicate the school's academic goals and the learners' academic achievement in schools where principals do not clearly formulate and communicate the school's academic goals.

To test for the degree of relationship between the principal's role of formulating and communicating the school's academic goals and the learners' academic achievement, the contingency coefficient (**C**) was calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}C &= \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}} \\ C &= \sqrt{\frac{62.00}{110 + 62.00}} \\ C &= 0.6 \rightarrow\end{aligned}$$

The high coefficient, close to one (1) clearly indicates the strong relationship between the principal's role of formulating and communicating the school's academic goals

and the learners' academic achievement. It is, therefore, essential for principals to formulate and communicate to educators clear academic goals for the school at the beginning of each school year.

The clearly stated school's academic goals, known to educators, help in setting the direction for the school as it moves towards achieving its academic objectives and mission.

4.3.2 Discussion of the learners' academic progress in the various school subjects

Ho: Null hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference between the learners' academic achievement in schools where principals and educators discuss the learners' academic progress in the various school subjects and the learners' academic achievement in schools where principals and educators do not discuss the learners' academic progress in the various school subjects.

Table 4.32: Discussion of learners' academic progress in various school subjects

Response to item 24					
Categories of schools	Yes		No		Total
	Obs.	Exp.	Obs.	Exp.	
Higher performing schools	47	29	7	25	54
Lower performing schools	13	31	43	25	56
Total	60		50		110

$\chi^2 = 47.54$, where (χ^2) is the calculated value of the chi-square test.

$\chi^2_{crit.} = 3.84$, where ($\chi^2_{crit.}$) is the critical value of the chi-square test.

df. = 1

At the level of significance 0.05, χ^2 value of 47.54 is greater than the $\chi^2_{crit.}$ value of 3.84. The null-hypothesis is, therefore, rejected. Therefore, the conclusion is that the discussion of learners' academic progress, by principal and teachers, in the various school subjects during the course of the year is very significant for the learners' academic achievement. Thus, there is a significant difference between the learners' academic achievement in schools where principals and educators discuss the learners' academic progress in the various school subjects and the learners' academic achievement in schools where principals and educators do not discuss the learners' academic progress in the various school subjects.

The relationship between the discussion of the learners' academic progress, by principals and teachers, in the various school subjects during the course of the year and the learners' academic achievement was determined by calculating the contingency coefficient (C) as follows:

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}}$$

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{47.54}{110 + 47.54}}$$

$$C = 0.6 \rightarrow$$

The high contingency coefficient, close to one (1) confirms the strong relationship between the expected joint discussion of the learners' academic progress in the various school subjects by principal and the educators, and the learners' academic performance. By regular discussion of the learners' academic progress in the various school subjects, the principal and the teachers are able to see if the targeted school's academic achievement will be realized or alternative strategies need to be designed if the targeted school's academic achievement is to be realized.

4.3.3 The principal conducts staff development at school

Ho: Null hypothesis 3

There is no significant difference between the academic achievement of learners in schools where principals conduct staff development and the academic achievement of learners in schools where principals do not conduct staff development.

Table 4.33: The principal conducts staff development at school

Response to item 27					
Categories of schools	Yes		No		Total
	Obs.	Exp.	Obs.	Exp.	
Higher performing schools	39	25	15	29	54
Lower performing schools	11	25	45	31	56
Total	50		60		110

$\chi^2 = 28.76$, where (χ^2) is the calculated value of the chi-square test.

$\chi^2_{crit.} = 3.84$, where, ($\chi^2_{crit.}$) is the critical value of the chi-square test.

df. = 1

At the level of significance 0.05, χ^2 value of 28.76 is greater than the χ^2_{crit} value of 3.84. The decision is to reject the null hypothesis. It is concluded that staff development has a significant influence on the learners' academic achievement. Thus there is a significant difference between the learners' academic achievement in schools

where principals conduct staff development and the learners' academic achievement in schools where principals do not conduct staff development.

To determine the relationship between the practice of staff development and the learners' academic achievement, the contingency coefficient (C) was calculated as follows:

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}}$$

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{28.76}{110 + 28.76}}$$

$$C = 0.5$$

→

The obtained coefficient of 0.5 is high enough to be considered as the evidence of the strong relationship between the learners' academic success and the practice of staff development by school principals.

4.3.4 The principal encourages the formation of academic networks with other schools

Ho: Null hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference between the learners' academic achievement in schools that maintain academic networks with other schools and the learners' academic achievement in schools that maintain no academic networks with other schools.

Table 4.34: The principal encourages the formation of academic networks with other schools

Response to item 30					
Categories of schools	Yes		No		Total
	Obs.	Exp.	Obs.	Exp.	
Higher performing schools	46	27	8	27	54
Lower performing schools	10	29	46	27	56
Total	56		54		110

$\chi^2 = 52.56$, where (χ^2) is the calculated value of the chi-square test.

$\chi^2_{crit.} = 3.84$, where ($\chi^2_{crit.}$) is the critical value of the chi-square test.

df = 1

At the level of significance 0.05, χ^2 value of 52.56 is greater than the $\chi^2_{crit.}$ value of 3.84. The decision is to reject the null hypothesis. The conclusion is that the formation of academic networks with other schools is significant for the learners' academic achievement. Therefore, there is significant difference between the learners' academic achievement in schools maintaining academic networks with other schools than academic achievement of learners in schools maintaining no academic network with other schools.

Then the relationship between the formation of academic networks with other schools and the learners' academic performance was determined by calculating the contingency coefficient (C) as follows:

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{\div^2}{N + \div^2}}$$

$$C = \sqrt{\frac{52.56}{110 + 52.56}}$$

$$C = 0.6 \rightarrow$$

The high contingency coefficient of 0.6 is an evidence of the strong relationship between the school's academic networks and the learners' academic achievement. It would be of great importance for the lower performing schools to form academic networks with higher performing schools. An academic network of such a nature enables the academically weak school to emulate the policies, procedures, practice and strategies of the academically strong school. Thereby the academically weak school can gradually improve its overall academic achievement over time.

4.4 CONCLUSION

In the foregoing chapter the researcher presented the results of the analysis of data, the interpretation of results and the hypotheses testing. From the results of data analysis, in this chapter, it became apparent that there are big differences between the practice of instructional leadership in the selected lower and the higher performing secondary schools in the Vryheid region. While the respondents from

the lower performing schools responded negatively to many items in the questionnaire, by contrast, the respondents from the higher performing schools responded positively to the same items in the questionnaire. The implication is that what principals do to promote effective teaching and learning in the higher performing schools, principals in the lower performing schools do not do.

Thus, it can be concluded that the differences in many aspects of the instructional leadership practice between the lower and the higher performing schools account for the differences in the academic performance of grade 12 learners in the two categories of schools. Also confirming the assertion that the practice of instructional leadership by principals accounts for the differences in the schools' academic achievement are the results of the statistical test (Chi-square test) of the null hypotheses carried out in section 4.3 above. The chi-square test (χ^2) of the selected aspects/variables of instructional leadership indicated that there is a strong link between the instructional leadership variables and the academic success of the learners at school. Thus, the conclusion can be made that the neglect of instructional leadership by principals in the lower performing schools has a significant negative impact on the learners' academic achievement in such schools.

In the following chapter, the researcher presents the summary, limitations, conclusions and recommendations of the study.